



Hodos, T. (2011). A Phoenician past and present. *Bulletin of the Royal Institute for Inter-Faith Studies*, 13, 23-45.

Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available:
<http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

Tamar Hodos

A PHOENICIAN PAST AND PRESENT

Abstract

THE HEART OF THE PHOENICIAN HOMELAND IS taken to be the coast of modern Lebanon from Tell Arqa to Tyre, although sometimes extending as far south as the Carmel Mountain Range and incorporating the Plain of Akko (Anderson 1990, 50). This territory attracted the interest of the Neo-Assyrian Empire, for its ports provided a means of economic power, which required political and military control, and it has been argued that commercial and trading interests dictated the Assyrians' foreign policy (Oded 1974, 39 with references). The Assyrians were long aware of the Phoenician city-states, but the first actual war between Assyria and the Phoenicians occurred during the reign of Shalmaneser III (858-824 BCE) during the middle of the ninth century BCE, with the battle of Qarqar (853 BCE) in the territory of Hamath, in which several Phoenician city-states allied against the Assyrian army (Niemeyer 2002, 102 notes that most Phoenician settlements belonged politically to a limited number of powerful city-states, especially Arvad, Byblos, Sidon and Tyre); crucially, not all of them allied against Shalmaneser. The account of relations between the Phoenician cities recorded in the El-Amarna letters of the Bronze Age implies long-term strife and competition between the individual Phoenician cities in their own political and commercial interactions. This tradition of disunity may explain why the Phoenicians collectively did not resist Shalmaneser's army (although it could be questioned why we might expect that they would work together; see below).

A number of Assyria's subject states rebelled between 782 and 745 BCE, and Assyria began to lose its grip over its frontiers, especially as it began to clash with the rising power of the kingdom of Urartu. In addition, civil war during the reigns of Shalmaneser III and his successor, Shamshi-Adad V (823-811 BCE) contributed to a more defensive policy

with regard to the empire and its subject city-states. This coincided with a period of weak monarchs, from Adad-nirari III (810-783 BCE), through Shalmaneser IV (782-772) and Ashur-dan III (771-755 BCE) to Ashur-nirari V (754-745 BCE). Nevertheless, the independently-minded Phoenician city-states were exploited by the Assyrians during this time (tribute from Tyre and Sidon was paid to Adad-nirari III), and became the focus of intensive campaigning by Tiglath Pileser III (744-727 BCE), who by the end of his reign dominated the entire Phoenician coast, the Palestinian coast, and perhaps as far north as the Amanus mountains (Oded 1974; Hodos 2006, 50-51; arguably, the records of the intervening kings are less complete; aside from the tribute to Adad-nirari III, there is little additional direct reference to the Phoenician city-states in the Assyrian annals from this time: Bunnens 1979; 1983; 1995, 228). The Battle of Qarqar may therefore be regarded as a turning point for some of the Phoenician city-states, for they began to establish settlements overseas—in Cyprus, North Africa and Spain by the end of the ninth century, and the subsequent turmoil within the Assyrian empire fostered this movement of Phoenicians to other regions in the Mediterranean during the eighth century (it is widely acknowledged that itinerant craftsmen and merchants traversed the Mediterranean during the tenth and ninth centuries, and that the establishment from the late ninth and eighth centuries of newly founded settlements overseas rather than as groups of individuals joining an existing settlement reflects a new phase of extension; see also Niemeyer 2004).

Contemporary Assyrian references themselves suggest that Phoenician kings acknowledged Assyria's hegemony and paid tribute so long as Assyrian sovereignty did not involve economic strangulation or jeopardize Phoenician commercial interests. For this reason, it has been suggested that the Phoenician-Assyrian relationship was a symbiotic one of tribute and the provision of materials and goods from the wider Mediterranean in exchange for maintained political independence, and that Phoenician expansion into the Mediterranean therefore was a self-determined one (Niemeyer 2002, 102-104; 2006, 159-60). To view this as symbiotic is misleading, however, as this circumstance ultimately derives from the political pressures exerted by the Neo-Assyrians on the Phoenician homeland city-states. Whether an Assyrian campaign or expedition was peaceful or not, the fact remains that a superpower began to extort money and goods from the Phoenician city-states—and others along the eastern Mediterranean littoral—and that this is at the time that the Phoenicians begin to step up their overseas activities cannot be coincidental. To flee such circumstances during this period is not unique, either; the presence of Aramaeans in western settlements such as Pithekoussai coincides with a time during which the territory of the

Aramaeans fell under the control of the Assyrian empire (see Hodos 2006, 25-28). The difference, however, is that, unlike the Aramaean cities, or Israelite and Judean ones, the Phoenician city-states were left autonomous by the Assyrians to enable them to meet the regional trading demands of Nimrud and the manufacturing centres of the Neo-Assyrian empire (Frankenstein 1979). Nevertheless, to characterize the payment of tribute of iron, gold, silver and commodities in exchange for political independence as symbiotic misses the point of mutual benefit in a symbiotic relationship. The Phoenicians gained nothing new from this relationship; they were merely allowed to maintain a political status quo. Furthermore, in order to meet the demands of Assyrians for primary materials, the Phoenicians were forced to extend their trading sphere and commodity production centres to beyond just the eastern Mediterranean—that is, beyond Cyprus. (For the role of the Levantine coast in an economic world system across the Mediterranean, see Sommer 2004.)

On Phoenician expansion

There has been much dispute between archaeological and literary sources for the foundation of these Mediterranean Phoenician settlements. Literature claims late twelfth century dates for settlements in the far West, such as Gades (1104 BCE) and Utica (1101 BCE) (Velleius Paterculus 1.2.1-3; Pliny the Elder 16.216), while Thucydides (Book 6) says that the Phoenicians were established all over the coast of Sicily before the Greeks arrived at the end of the eighth century (for discussions of the literary record, see Moscati 1966, 127-36; Aubet 2001, 6-13; Botto 2005; see also Lipinski 2004). In Sicily, there is absolutely no material evidence for Phoenician settlement anywhere around the island, except for western Sicily, initially with the site of Motya, although archaeological evidence suggests it was not founded until the end of the eighth century. Phoenician settlement in the far western Mediterranean is now being attested through radiocarbon dates to the end of the ninth century, but only at Carthage, which is supported by a literary foundation date to 814 BCE, and along the Malaga coast, for which there is no extant literary record (Carthage: Docter et al. 2005; Malaga: Aubet 2001, 305; various contributions in Bierling 2002; see also Nijboer 2006a; Sagona 2004; Sommer 2005; Niemeyer et al. 2007).

Phoenicians were regularly traversing the Mediterranean from the eleventh century onwards and engaging with local communities through the exchange of goods, especially the Greeks (for recent discussions surrounding chronologies of the Mediterranean Iron Age, see Nijboer 2005; 2006b). In particular, the presence of Near Eastern metal work and other items in tenth century Greek and other Mediterranean

contexts has been attributed specifically to Phoenician mercantile activity (e.g. Papadopoulos 1997; 1998; Gubel 2006), while resident or itinerant Phoenician craftsmen themselves have been postulated on Rhodes and Crete from the ninth century (Coldstream 1969; **Shaw 1989**; Stampedis 2003; see also Negbi 1992; Bouzek 1997). Such activity has been described as a kind of merchant venturers phase of Phoenician Mediterranean activity, in which craftsmen as well as traders, prospectors and agents travelled the Mediterranean (described as such largely by Niemeyer, and most recently in 2006).

This conceptualization is designed to take into account not only the tenth and ninth century material that found its way into Greek settlements, but also arguments for Near Eastern craftsmen working in Greek contexts at this time, such as at Ialysos, Athens, Lefkandi, Kos, and on Crete (Kommos, Knossos, Eleutherna). While some have challenged the extent of Phoenician residence abroad before the eighth century, even if in the context of *enoikismo* (a settling amongst others)—such as Lemos, who argues in favour of trade and intermarriage more than for resident craftsmen (2003), and Raaflaub, who emphasizes the role played by Greek aristocrats in the dissemination of ideas (2004) and which is a view that has been extended back to the tenth and ninth centuries (e.g. Crielaard 1992/93; 1999; Boardman 1999; 2001)—no one doubts that individual Phoenicians, or small groups of Phoenicians, probably from a single city, were travelling the Mediterranean and staying, whether temporarily or permanently, in foreign settlements and engaging with the life of these communities, and influencing their culture values (Niemeyer 2003 and 2004 discuss how Phoenician goods may have served as status indicators in Greek and other contexts).

From the late ninth century and over the course of the eighth and seventh centuries, permanent collective settlements of Phoenicians were established. This phenomenon is often seen as accompanied by expanded trade (Niemeyer 2002, 99). Niemeyer argues that such foundations were not colonies in a strict sense (e.g. 2006, 155, although he does not define what that strict sense is, but he implies it in 1990, 484 through comparison with criteria for a *polis*), and that rarely was the hinterland politically or administratively a dependent territory. For Niemeyer, economically these settlements would have been dependent on the continued arrival of newcomers (2002). I will return to these ideas later.

The idea of a two-step process of Phoenician activity in the Mediterranean during the Iron Age is not a new one. Moscati was one of the first to suggest that initially the Phoenicians limited themselves in the Mediterranean to landing-stages and, to explain the early settlements discussed in ancient sources but unattested archaeologically, travelled

as small groups of settlers who lived in simple conditions and left behind no architectural or material remains. He argued that those material remains identified as Phoenician represent a consolidation phase, whereby they established permanent structures and infrastructure for self-sufficiency (1966, 127-36). He suggested that Phoenicians not only created settlements that developed into colonies but that small groups founded trading posts in ethnically and politically different regions and either remained there as small settlements or dissolved. Furthermore, he saw Carthage's establishment of colonies across the North African coast as a secondary movement that was contemporaneous with the main Phoenician colonial movement. Aubet has recently referred to the materially visible settlements as a second phase of colonization that is the first one to be documented archaeologically (e.g. 2001, 231).

These ideas have been expounded upon by Niemeyer, in particular. In a series of articles since 1990, he has espoused a pre-colonization phase—parallel to a Greek pre-colonization that is so often argued for (Blakeway 1935; more recently see various contributions in Descoeudres 1990; Tsetskhladze and De Angelis 1994; see also Dominguez 1989; Ridgway 2004)—followed by a settlement phase, which he dubs an expansion rather than a colonization, to contrast it with the nature of contemporary Greek overseas settlements and activities (Niemeyer 1990; 1993; 1995). It is the reason for their foundation that Niemeyer emphasizes their distinctiveness from Greek settlements, which he assesses as a contemporary and parallel process (1990, 480), for he suggests that Phoenician provision of iron and precious metals for the Assyrians in exchange for political independence was the primary reason for the foundation of the series of settlements in the central and western Mediterranean.

This does not take away from the general consensus that Phoenician activity in the Mediterranean may be viewed as a two-step process in which the first consisted of élite merchants and their craftsmen instigating social exchanges with the Mediterranean world during the tenth and ninth centuries, perhaps as a means of tapping into new markets for resources. There is no reason that this should be considered as a period of prospection for new areas for settlement, however, which the term 'pre-colonial' implies. The consolidation of regularly-used or strategic landing sites into permanently occupied Phoenician communities may have been a practical one arising from the nature of Phoenician activity at the beginning of the first millennium; the establishment of a permanent base at Carthage at the end of the ninth century no doubt capitalized upon Phoenician knowledge of central Mediterranean resources, while the ninth century dates for the Nora stele and fragment suggests the Phoenicians had been cognisant of the Tyrrhenian region for quite

some time. Carthage was carefully selected with long-term interests and sustainability in mind; its location allowed it to control sea routes between Italy and the West, while the city itself was designed with a city wall that encompassed sufficient green space to support a large population during a time of siege (Turfa 2001; see also Lancel 1995). It is the very nature of the more permanent Phoenician settlements that has been the subject of much discussion. Thus, they are often described as ports of trade, to contrast them explicitly with the quest for land often assumed of the Greek overseas settlements (Niemeyer 1990 and subsequently). More recently, however, a question has been raised as to whether or not one can even characterize them collectively by a single model (van Dommelen 2005; much the same could be argued for Greek settlements as material and socio-cultural diversity is increasingly emphasized; e.g. papers in Tsatskheladze 1999 and Lomas 2004). This calls for a reassessment of the similarities and differences between overseas Greek and Phoenician settlements.

Views of the Other

Study of the Phoenicians and the Greeks has traditionally been approached by separate sets of scholars: Near Eastern specialists studied the Phoenicians, while Classical Archaeologists focused upon the Greeks. Such division goes back to nineteenth century Western European scholarship, where pioneer field archaeologists used the ancient Classical literary sources from Homer onwards to direct their work (and interpretations) in the Greek world (e.g. Schliemann at Troy; Evans at Knossos; see Trigger 1989), while those armed with the Bible as their literary resource focused upon the ancient Near East in a similar manner (Moorey 1991; although both were well schooled in the Bible and Classics, as befitted a formal education during that time). Despite the fact that both Greeks and Phoenicians established overseas settlements throughout the Mediterranean, and sometimes in the same geographical territory, such as Sicily, study of these expansions has continued along those very lines, in which it is Classical scholars who have embraced study of the Greeks in overseas settlements, while research on the Phoenicians in the Mediterranean has largely been undertaken by Near Eastern specialists (for specifically Greek colonial scholarship, see, for example Hodos 2006, 10-12; for succinct accounts of the genesis of Phoenician scholarship, see Gras, Rouillard and Teixidor 1989, **Pastor Borgoñon 1992**; Moscati 1993; Vella 1996; Lancel 1995, 438-46 specifically for Carthage).

Competition between the Greeks and Phoenicians is widely attested in ancient historical sources, and this sense of antagonism has been replicated in Classical and Near Eastern scholars' approaches to the study of

the colonies themselves. This rivalry began with questions over the dates of the earliest colonies, as if an issue of Mediterranean supremacy depended upon it. Beloch's late nineteenth century study of the Greeks concluded that Phoenician expansion in the Mediterranean could not begin before the eighth century, and therefore must have been as a means of competition with the Greeks, who had already founded overseas colonies (1893-1904). In opposition to this, Moscati's work, one of the first to discuss in detail Phoenician expansion in the Mediterranean, appears almost defensive when he argues that lack of material evidence that predates the eighth century—as was the case until only very recently—is no reason to doubt the literary records of various cultures (Greek, Biblical, Phoenician) that attest Phoenician activity in the Mediterranean far earlier. For instance, Moscati regarded the bronze statuette of Melquart from near Selinus as of second millennium date and therefore indicative of Phoenician presence in Sicily at that time (1966, 128). Mercantile activity versus settlement here are merged into one notion of primacy and supremacy.

One of the difficulties in studying Greek or Phoenician colonization has been the generalizations of each culture and their colonial mechanisms by the other in both ancient sources and, until very recently, modern scholarship. For instance, Greek references to the Phoenicians first appear in Homer, who calls the Phoenicians *Sidonoi*. A question that has vexed modern scholarship is over the intention of this term: does Homer mean Sidonians specifically, or is Sidonians a generalization for all Phoenicians? On the one hand, Culican has pointed out that *Sidonoi* scans better in Homeric hexameter than the Tyrian equivalent (1982a). However, it is recorded by Justinus (18.3.5) that in 1184 BCE Sidon founded Tyre; this would have been a refounding, perhaps after a period of decline or desettlement that may be tied to the general phase associated with the activities of the Sea Peoples, for occupation at Tyre extends to considerably earlier times (Gubel 1994, 341-2; Niemeyer 2006, 146). For this reason, Homer's extension of the Sidon accolade to include other Phoenician settlements may not be unreasonable (Niemeyer 2002, 92). Furthermore, in the eleventh and tenth centuries, Sidon may have been the more important or dominant city, especially to have spearheaded the re-founding of Tyre. In addition, the popularity of Astarte in a number of the subsequently-founded Phoenician overseas communities and the fact that she was the protective deity of Sidon itself has suggested to some that Homer's references to the Phoenicians as specifically Sidonians is understandable (Bunnens 1995, 223 f.; Röllig 1982, 18; see also Fletcher 2004). But can this really be the case? Place names in the Mediterranean of *phoinikous* have implied Phoenicians (e.g. Cythera's eastern port, where Herodotus says the sanctuary of Aphrodite Ourania

was founded by Phoenicians), and we do not find place names derived from individual Phoenician cities. At the same time, these names may be nothing more than reference to purple dye manufacturing. *Phoinix*—from which the term *Phoenician* derives—is a Greek word meaning purple-red or crimson (it should be noted that an individual named Phoinix is mentioned in the *Iliad* 9.425 ff. as the old horseman and mentor of Achilles, although he hails from Hellas). Thus, the specific meanings behind Greek references to Phoenicians remain open to interpretation.

No similar umbrella term exists in our Near Eastern sources, since Phoenicia was not a single state but rather a collection of individual sovereign states. The Old Testament describes them through reference to their city-state (e.g. Gen. 10.15; Judges 3.3, 10.6, 18.7; Ezekiel 28; I Kings 5.20, 16.31 all references to Sidonians. For Tyre: Amos 1.9-10; Ezekiel 26-28; I Kings 6g and II Chronicle 3 refer to Tyrenian craftsmen). In Assyrian documents, they are designated by the determinative URU (city, town) and the determinative KUR (land, territory, country), and a Phoenician city may be designated by both in the same document (Oded 1974, 39-40; see Moscati 1993, who discusses terminology surrounding Phoenicians and Phoenicia). This dual nature of the name serving for both city and territory with a determinative to distinguish the two is a distinctive feature of the Phoenician city-states and contrasts with the Greek city-states, in which two separate terms are used to distinguish between the city itself and its wider region of territorial control, with the city name serving as the root for the expression of territory (e.g. Athens/Attica; Corinth/Corinthia).

We have very few Phoenician texts or monumental inscriptions; most of our literary record of the Phoenicians appears as more passing references in Assyrian, Biblical and Graeco-Roman sources (see contributions in Krings 1995), none of which had any particular interest in providing details since in large part the Phoenicians were being perceived as an enemy or merely an 'other' to be conquered, controlled or exploited. In the two references in the *Iliad*, 6.288 ff. and 23.740 ff., the Sidonians are mentioned with regard to luxury production, of fabric and silver-working respectively, and these luxuries are associated with élite/royal gift-exchange, especially in the case of the silver bowl that was set by Achilles as a prize in the funeral games of Patroklos, a vessel that had a complex history of élite ownership and royal gift-exchange. This is echoed again in the *Odyssey* 4.614-619, when Menelaos of Sparta gives Telemachos a silver mixing bowl that had been a gift to him from the king of Sidon. Other references to the Phoenicians in the *Odyssey*, which are more numerous, relate to their seamanship, sailing and trading practices, and are often described with negative overtones as a literary trope

(Winter 1995). Valued Phoenician textiles, metal crafts and seafaring are corroborated by other ancient textual reference, particularly annals of the Neo-Assyrian empire and the Old Testament, although archaeological evidence suggests a much wider range of goods and objects were manufactured, traded or given as tribute by the Phoenicians, and that cargoes were varied.

In modern scholarship, the same crimes of generalizations can be levied. While Greek scholars will take great pains to point out diversity among the Greek city-states and their colonies, they do not give the same emphasis to the diversity and independence between the Phoenician city-states. Yet Tyre, Sidon, Byblos, Berytus, Ugarit and Arwad were independent city-states who were in constant rivalry with one another except when united against a common adversary, much like the Greek city-states, themselves (for modern scholarly debate on use of the term Phoenician and Phoenicians: Pastor Borgoñon 1988/90; Morris 1992; Moscati 1993, 9-14; papers in Krings 1995). Greek scholarship continues to lump them together as Phoenicians, however, (e.g. Boardman 2005; 2006; Coldstream 1998; 2000), especially in their discussions of Phoenician interaction with the various Greek populations, notably Euboeans. Very recently, there has been an attempt to distinguish influences and impacts of individual Phoenician city-states in the wider Mediterranean, through a recent project to identify and distinguish between Sidonian and Tyrian trade routes in the Mediterranean via a study of Egyptianizing amulets (Fletcher 2004); although some of the archaeological assumptions made by this research may be justifiably questioned (Boardman 2005, 288-90), a case for distinction may be viewed in other aspects of material culture (Gubel 2006).

Contested Terminologies

Let us return to the question of the colonies, themselves. Much work has gone into defining the natures of the Greek colonies and the Phoenician colonies in the Mediterranean, often in contrast with one another, but usually with very little regard for other colonial examples. The term *colony* in English has traditionally meant nothing more than a settlement in a new country that was subject to a parent state. This term derived from the Latin *colonia*, which was used by Roman writers to indicate a variety of settlements that seem to have been distinguished by their constitutions, with an emphasis on citizenship, and that were often federal foundations. These meanings do not fit the varieties of overseas settlements types of the Greeks or Phoenicians, however, and this has given rise to recent dissatisfaction with English terminology to describe and discuss the nature of Iron Age settling at overseas sites; there has even been a call to dismiss the term altogether, especially since such founda-

tions were not necessarily always state-directed (e.g. Osborne 1998, picked up by Gosden 2004; for more general discussions about colonization during this period, see van Dommelen 2002; 2005; Owen 2005; Hodos 2006, 9-22; Tsatskhladze 2006b). I have argued elsewhere that the term remains a useful one if one emphasizes the cultural contact aspect of a colonial context—the daily experience and juxtaposition of ‘self’ and ‘other’ in such a milieu and its impact in communicating cultural codes and the reinterpretation of objects and customs by those other local populations (Hodos 2006, 22). The emphasis on reinterpretation and articulation of ideas from other cultures is a key focus in postcolonial approaches (Hodos 2008). Within a postcolonial framework of interpretation, therefore, and which many have adopted, it may still be appropriate to use the term (Hodos 2006, 22; see also van Dommelen 2005).

Despite pains taken by Greek and Phoenician scholars to highlight differences as they seek to define their own sets of colonies (e.g. Niemeyer 2002, 100 for Phoenician colonies; Boardman 1999 for Greek ones), there nevertheless are shared characteristics between Greek and Phoenician colonies. Niemeyer cites several decisive criteria for a choice of Phoenician overseas settlement, which reproduce the settlement pattern of the Phoenician homeland: a not-too-large settlement area within natural borders; easy defence, such as an island or spit; good harbours; proximity to navigational aids; open access to an adjacent and more distance hinterland. It is these traits, he says, that reflect that the Phoenicians had “dramatically different goals from the Greek colonisation movement, which mainly focused on the gain of arable land” (2002, 100) (Carthage is an exception to this, he notes). Evidence from the far western Mediterranean, for example, illustrates that a common characteristic of Phoenician settlements in this region was that the settlement be either on an offshore island or, more commonly, positioned on a river delta for communication and mercantile purposes as well as for access to fertile lands and the possibility of irrigated crops (Aubet 2001, 314). Their cemeteries were situated outside the city walls and/or separated from the colony by a channel of water (e.g. Gadir; Toscanos, Morro, Lagos, Almuñécar: Aubet 2001, 329-337).

Many of these characteristics are down to common sense and are replicated in many contemporary coastal Greek settlements, as well. Indeed, like their Phoenician counterparts, the Greek settlements were also of modest size that were naturally bounded, usually by rivers and ridges (e.g. Siris; Pithekoussai) rather than encircling bodies of water (although Syracuse initially occupied just the offshore island of Ortygia). The Greeks chose their locations with a similar set of criteria to the Phoenicians, and it is clear to see that they were easily defensible by their very location, and were located near easily navigable points, such

as mountains or peaks (e.g. Etna; Gebel Akhdar) or at the mouths of rivers (e.g. Massalia; Taras). And certainly access to arable land is a characteristic of virtually every Greek settlement. In the case of cemetery locations, they were also always outside of the urban environment, either separated from the city by a body of water (e.g. Syracuse), or beyond the city walls (e.g. Megara Hyblaea, Akragas, Metapontum, Cyrene) (Boardman 1999; Tsatskheladze 2006a). The general typology of these early Greek and Phoenician settlements, therefore, is remarkably similar. Differences are better attributed to specific local conditions than for any ideological reasons.

This leads to the next major area of interpretive distinction between Phoenician and Greek colonies. The presence of a hinterland has been one of the main distinctions between descriptive models of Greek and Phoenician colonization: Aubet observes that the essential characteristic of the Greek colony lies in the fact that it had its own agricultural land, and that the autonomy of the colonial structure depended upon such territorial control and organization (2001, 348). Niemeyer is adamant that only in rare cases did an overseas Phoenician settlement have any kind of political or administrative control over its hinterland as a dependent territory, suggesting instead that economically the settlement would have been dependent on newcomers (2002, 96; 2006, 155; this does not make practical sense, though, for a number of reasons. Newcomers who bring supplies and then stay will require yet more newcomers to arrive with even more supplies. Secondly, sailing seasons in the Mediterranean means that supply was seasonal and thus could not be maintained throughout the year).

In fact, the ancient Greeks' choice of terminology reflects a more complex circumstance than mere definition. Rather, they chose to describe a settlement in a particular way with regard to the context of discussion, not as a means of definition (Hodos 2006, 19-20). The two terms often used by ancient authors are *apoikia* and *emporion* (for a summary of recent discussion with bibliography, see Tsatskheladze 2006b, xxxviii-xlii; see also Hansen and Nielsen 2004; Greek terminology has received extensive attention in recent years, particularly in the numerous publications by the Copenhagen Polis Centre, and the reader is directed towards its output for more detailed discussion). The former is defined as a home away from home and will possess *polis*-related socio-political characteristics (especially laws: see papers in Harris and Rubenstein 2004) as well as physical ones, most notably a *chora*, or hinterland, which would have provided the necessary agrarian base for the settlement's self-sufficiency (Malkin 1997, 27; see also Morris 1991; Malkin 1994; Wilson 1997). An *emporion*, on the other hand, is primarily commercial, and since Greek commerce was largely focused on the sea, characteristics of

an *emporion* include a harbour, quay, warehouses, and associated administrative buildings (as in Herodotus' description of Naukratis: 2.178-9; Hansen 2006); it is presumed by modern scholarship that an *emporion* will have no call upon a *chora*, especially since no references to hinterland usage are made by ancient authors when they discuss *emporion* (Hansen 2006, 32-34 cites only one example of a named *emporion* possessing a hinterland, which is Pistiros, but the inscription, SEG 43 486.10-12, dates to the mid-fourth century; indeed, our terminology derives mainly from the Classical period, and there are questions over how appropriate it may be to apply these terms to settlements of the Archaic period: Hansen 2006, 2-3). Yet settlements can be both (other discussion has also emphasized use or lack of a hinterland as a defining characteristic from political and economic perspectives: see Hodos 2006, 21-22 for discussion of the Branigan and Polanyi models), and the context of such terminology is enlightening for the fluidity of description, and the error of our ways in assuming fixed meanings. For example, Herodotus (4.17.1) cites Olbia in the Black Sea as the *emporion* of Borysthenes, although its citizens are *Olbiopolites* (4.18.1; see also Hind 1995/96; Hind 1997). Rather than describing Olbia and its residents as a type of settlement city, Herodotus is emphasizing specific characteristics in his choice of terminology in each passage. In the former, the context is Olbia's coastal location, so it is logical that he would emphasize its function as a port, hence his choice of a term that is associated with ports engaged with trade is appropriate. In the latter passage, it is the colonists themselves he mentions in his geographical tour of where the various Scythian tribes live in relation to the Greek settlements along the Bug river. Thus, part of the significance for Herodotus is the fact that the Greeks adhere to the ideals of the polis, for obedience to the rule of law is one of the traits that distinguishes the civilized Greeks from their barbarian neighbours (Harris and Rubenstein 2004, 1, with examples). Therefore, literary context determines the terminology, not an exclusive nature of the settlement itself.

Phoenician settlements have traditionally been described as purely trading sites, in contrast to the Greek colonies, which are generally regarded as land-hungry self-sufficient settlements (Niemeyer 1990, 485 and 488: Phoenician settlements were "designed and established only to consolidate and secure these early trade relationships which were threatened by the new and aggressive colonization movement of the Greeks"; see also 1993, 341; see also Boardman 2001; 2006). There is more to these than just trade, however. In one sense, the Phoenician colonies may be characterized as a trade diaspora. This has been defined as inter-regional exchange networks composed of spatially dispersed specialized merchant groups (Stein 2002; Cohen 1971). These groups will be cultur-

ally distinct, socially independent and organizationally cohesive from the communities in which they have settled. They will retain close economic and social ties with related communities who define themselves in terms of the same general cultural identity. They are communities that specialize in exchange while maintaining a separate cultural identity from their host communities. These host communities need not be a joined urban environment but may be more regionally construed. Political stability needs to exist within both the host and diasporic communities in order for the long-distance exchanges to be secured and maintained. These are not especially novel ideas for interpreting Phoenician settlements. Aubet, for instance, drawing upon the work of Curtin (1984) discusses them as a commercial diaspora (2001, 350-1), which focuses more on mercantile specialization and a metropolitan leader but equally emphasizes group solidarity.

Whichever model, it is the idea that there are shared aspects of identity among different diaspora communities that provides the framework for the exchange system to function reliably over time. Common identity may be reflected in similar sociocultural practices. In the case of the Phoenicians, this is particularly evident in their language and religious practices, as well as ceramic production. Similar is not the same as identical, however, and in each aspect regional variations may be detected. The Phoenician alphabet, for instance, had a Carthaginian derivative that, by the sixth century BCE, reflects the evolution of a distinct dialect, known as Punic. Its sphere of usage was around those regions that formed part of the Carthaginian cultural and material koine, especially Sicily, Sardinia, Malta, the Balearics, and southern Spain (Markoe 2000, 114). In the sphere of religion, the practice of immolating children in a *tophet* is a feature more readily found in the Phoenician colonies of the far west than in the homeland. Finally, ceramic differentiation can be demonstrated in several spheres, including a koine centred between Carthage, Sicily, Sardinia and Ischia (see Hodos 2006, 132-133; see also Culican 1982b; Anderson 1990), and another material cluster in the far west (Aubet 2001, 330). Yet despite these differences, there are other shared indicators of a common identity at a broader level, such as the use of the Phoenician alphabet, despite regional written versions (the same can be said for Greek, which is regarded as the same language with regional written and spoken forms), worship of Melkart, but again with regional variation, and widely-used shapes and styles of pottery that are Phoenician in origin. Thus, the use of a single model may still be appropriate as a means of identification, but perhaps not necessarily for the purposes of classification, since regional differences and local variations require sub-division that will dilute the overall sense of similarity. This is the nature of post-modern theories that deconstruct the metanarra-

tives (Hodos 2008). In the case of Greek and Phoenician colonization, from an explicitly post-colonial perspective it is clear that the traditional metanarratives are no longer valid in their entirety, but that does not mean that all their elements should be discarded. Rather, new metanarratives are emerging that are perhaps more circumscribed by regional consideration.

Furthermore, there is also a growing amount of evidence that many Phoenician settlements did exploit their hinterland for agrarian reasons as well as for territorial control. In Sardinia, it has been demonstrated that the Phoenicians expanded into the countryside and integrated it into the territories of their coastal settlements. The Phoenicians initially founded the coastal settlements of Nora and Tharros along the south and western coasts respectively, and Sulcis on the south-western offshore island of Sant'Antioco, in the middle of the eighth century BCE. During the later seventh century, new sites were established, presumably to facilitate contacts with the interior. Their situations reflect a strategic awareness of routes between the coast and the mineral-rich interior, and thus avenues of control, and include hilltop strongholds. Some were clearly located to secure easy and direct access to inland fertile plains. The location of these sites and the subsequent distribution of Phoenician pottery throughout the island reveal an increased Phoenician involvement in the internal affairs of Sardinia (**van Dommelen 1998**). In Spain, it has been demonstrated that the Phoenician settlements in the region of modern Malaga were engaged more with agrarian output for their own self-sufficiency as well as for commercial agricultural gains, since the region is not connected easily to the more metal-rich areas of Spain. A high percentage of bovine bones from Toscanos indicates that cattle were raised for human consumption as well as serving as draught animals, which suggests indirectly agricultural practices along the Vélez river, while the faunal record from Cerro del Villar demonstrates that intensive animal husbandry was practised, based mainly on grazing larger livestock such as pigs and cattle, while millstones and notable quantities of wheat and barley, and extensive cropping, suggest cereal growing in a radius of 18 kilometres; wine was also produced and marketed (Aubet 2001, 315-24).

It is interesting that a Phoenician agricultural significance is evident in geographical areas where there were no Greek colonies to contend with. The Greeks did not have a foothold in Sardinia, and they were able to establish an interest in the far west only in the sixth century, when the Phoenician settlements themselves were losing their commercial strength as a result of the fall of Tyre, the collapse of the silver trade between Tartessos and the east, and the political rise of Carthage, which began to change the dynamics of their diasporic interaction. In contrast,

in places like Sicily, where Greeks and Phoenicians were territorially co-resident, it is the Greeks who expand faster and further, but not to the exclusion of the Phoenicians. During the sixth century, Palermo and Solunto were established, circumscribing for the Phoenicians the north-western corner of the island in terms of territorial control. While no doubt these served as trading stations, their locations secured for them good agricultural land, and the development of local industries from the early days of the settlements suggests alternative purposes beyond mere trade: at Motya, for instance, iron working and purple dye production are attested from the seventh century (Aubet 2001, 233; see also Hodos 2006, 91). If the systematic expansion to control regions is regarded as land hunger, which the Greeks are often accused of, whether for commercial or agricultural purposes, then the Phoenicians were often equally guilty of such practices, too. Nevertheless the establishment of heavy industry at Motya and mainland Sicilian Phoenician cities suggests that if we looked in the hinterland, we might find more influence than we think, although to date this has not been an avenue of study in Sicily (Albanese Procelli's very recent distributional study of pilgrim flasks and other Phoenician types in non-Phoenician Sicilian contexts during the eighth and seventh centuries—interpreted for the moment as evidence for trade—may perhaps be reconsidered from such a perspective in due course when additional comparative data is available: Albanese Procelli 2006).

Thus, even the Phoenician colonies themselves cannot be categorized by a single means of definition, for some were clearly established to capitalize upon trade opportunities for metal resources, such as Gadir and those in Sardinia to a lesser extent, while others clearly served other purposes, whether it was to control sea routes, like Carthage, or for agricultural output, like the Malaga coastline settlements or perhaps those in Sicily and Sardinia. Furthermore, it is clear that settlements responded to their local conditions, particularly if there was competition with other populations with pan-Mediterranean interests, such as the Greeks. Is there still a role for a single model within this interpretation, however? Although in this period of post-colonial deconstruction of previous, widely-held beliefs of general applicability, one may prefer to discard the term metanarrative, our means of expressing the global concepts of common cultural traits are arguably now more about the essences of shared notions of identity rather than descriptions of identically replicated practices. Such interpretation allows us to think about those common elements collectively while at the same time allowing for local variation within a set of shared characteristics. The focus, therefore, is less on explicit practices and more on the notions of expressions of identities in various social, cultural and even physical contexts (see papers in

Hales and Hodos 2008).

Conclusions

Common sense suggests that fundamental material practices of overseas settlers, whether Greek, Phoenician or other, may not have been as dramatically different as scholars divided by disciplines have argued in the past. In fact, such similarities in practice should not surprise us, given the long history of common discourse of social customs between the Greeks and Phoenicians, which extends to at least the tenth century, and indeed with other Near Eastern populations, as evidenced by Greek and Near Eastern objects found in one another's contexts during this time (recently, e.g. Hodos 2006, 4-5 and 33-37; Coldstream 1998; 2006). This is at a time when Cyprus must have played a crucial role, with Greek, Phoenician and Cypriot residents, and there is substantial evidence for Greek-Cypriot élite interaction and Cypriot exchange with the central Mediterranean at this time (Crielaard 1998, Sherratt 2003). These interactions gave rise to a common language of ritualized gift-giving, that in itself implies knowledge of cultural codes of one another (Crielaard 1998; Coldstream 2000; Luke 2003, 50-54; Hodos 2006, 37). We recognize this as the period of the so-called merchant venturers phase, although it may perhaps be better viewed as a time of élite exchange, for the foreign objects that found their way into Greek, Phoenician and Near Eastern communities were deposited in high-status contexts (élite burials in Greece; palace settings in the Near East). By the eighth century, this gave way to the more regular, quantifiably greater and less exclusive exchanges that we view as trade. The shared values that make such exchanges equitable and valuable to such a variety of individuals, élites and non-élites, suggests that we should take a broader look at where collaboration may have taken place, like the scribal class in the exchange of knowledge about writing; or the seafaring class who were traversing the Mediterranean. Indeed, the story of Odysseus seeking safe passage on a Phoenician ship to evade capture (*Odyssey* 14.285-313) suggests that Greek and Phoenicians working in cooperation with one another on cargo ships was not an uncommon occurrence.

Such cultural understandings ultimately gave rise to a foundation myth for Carthage, conveyed to us by Classical authors (Flavius Josephus *C. Ap.* 1.125; Justinus 18.4-6) and which is accepted by Phoenician scholarship (Aubet 2001, 214-18; Niemeyer 2006, 161) in which the foundation of Carthage was a means of settling a political conflict in Tyre at the end of the ninth century BCE. Thus, just as we hear about political stasis in Greece giving rise to the establishment of colonies, so we see a similar situation in the Phoenician world. Literature records a politically stratified population, with a king leading a political class to govern. The

death of the king before his heirs come of age leads to conflict between the elder sister Elishat (Elissa; Dido) and her younger brother Pumayyaton (Pumai; Pygmalion) to rule. It is the sister who departs with aristocratic supporters to establish the colony of Carthage. The interesting aspect to note here, however, is that our record of the myth is Greek (first recorded by Timaeus of Taormina, at the beginning of the third century BCE, and repeated by Menander of Ephesus in the first half of the second century BCE, whose notes were collected by Flavius Josephus: Lancel 1995, 22-23). This foundation myth, which finds parallels to the foundation myths of Greek colonies (e.g. Syracuse, also founded due to political stasis), puts Carthage on a par with other politically strong Greek colonies, despite the fact that Carthage was a city with which the Greeks had been directly engaged in conflict in Sicily at the end of the fifth century, thus forming part of Timaeus' local history. Carthage, therefore, would have been a worthy opponent, and the Greeks may have recognized its 'imperialistic' expansion (Bartoloni 2003, 200) as a parallel for Athens' own fifth century activities. Yet this is not the only example of foundation myths for Phoenician colonies that have been passed down. Strabo compiled tales with regard to colonies in Spain, like Gadir (3.5, 5). In this myth, we are told the Tyrians set forth to found the settlement on the order of an oracle, who gives precise directions. Similar oracular foundation myths are common amongst Greek colonies, as well (e.g. Cyrene; Tarentum; Rhegium; the chronological inconsistencies with regard to religious practices or archaeological material do not concern us here). There are alternative tales regarding the foundation of Gadir which tell of a great storm or chance that led to the settlement's founding, themes that are also not uncommon in the foundation tales of Greek overseas settlements. The expression of foundation myths for Phoenician settlements, by the Greeks and with such similar tropes to Greek tales, betrays a greater recognition and appreciation of shared traits and experiences between Greeks and Phoenicians than is usually acknowledged by modern scholarship.

With so much evidence for cultural understanding, shared material interests, and similarity in practices, why should we expect all these overseas settlements to be drastically different from one another? Circulation of myth, the dissemination of the Phoenician alphabet to the Greeks, and knowledge of one another from long-standing elite relations from at least the tenth century down to the working practices of the sailors attested in Homer suggests a number of collaborations (Boardman discusses the camaraderie of seafarers that overrides national differences and outlines overlapping and divergent sea routes between east and west in the Mediterranean; 2001). Therefore, rather than always trying to see Phoenician overseas settlements in opposition to Greek ones,

let us also remember the similarities. In addition, Greek and Phoenician goods have been found in one another's colonies, suggesting at the very least shared material interests and possibly social values, and therefore a knowledge of each other's culture, taste and market, or at the very best co-residence (although Winter has suggested that a mixture of goods at a particular site may not necessarily reflect cooperative ventures but may instead be a sign of competition at particular markets; 1995, 254-5; competition itself demonstrates shared knowledge of who the competition is in order for a party to be able to offer something by which to make a profit, or at least engage in the competition; see Hodos 2006, 37 and 85-88). With common discourse clear on so many material and historical levels, why should we resist the idea that there might be similarities between a number of physical and social features of Greek and Phoenician overseas settlements? Even the overarching reasons for colonization may not have been that different. As I have pointed out already, land hunger for agrarian reasons is clear amongst a number of Greek and Phoenician colonies, and both cultures were interested in capitalizing upon trading opportunities for financial gain, a mutually applicable interpretation that has previously been avoided by scholarship seeking difference and distinction in a quest for a kind of historical primacy. Furthermore, the mechanisms for achieving these aims are often much more closely related than we usually associate, although regional circumstances and situations may result in local variation. Scholars often spend too much time ring-fencing their own area for exclusive study and unique emphasis. Occasionally, however, it is helpful to step back and remind ourselves that similarities are acceptable, too.

REFERENCES

- Albanese Procelli, R. M. 2006. Pilgrim flasks dalla Sicilia. In *Across frontiers: Etruscans, Greeks, Phoenicians and Cypriots. Studies in honour of David Ridgway and Francesca Romana Serra Ridgway*, ed. E. Herring, I. Lemos, F. Lo Schiavo, L. Vagnetti, R. Whitehouse and J. Wilkins, 111-25. London: Accordia.
- Anderson, W. P. 1990. The beginnings of Phoenician pottery: Vessel shape, style, and ceramic technology in the early phase of the Phoenician Iron Age. *BASOR* 279 : 35-54.
- Aubet, M.E. 2001.² *The Phoenicians and the West: Politics, colonies, and trade*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bartoloni, P. 2003. The Phoenicians and Carthage in the central Mediterranean between the 8th and the 5th centuries BC. In *Ploes: Sea routes: Interconnections in the Mediterranean, 16th-6th c. BC: Proceedings of the international symposium held at Rethymnon, Crete, September 29th-October 2nd, 2002*, ed. N. C. Stampolidis and V. Karageorghis, 197-200. Athens: University of Crete and the A. G. Leventis Foundation.
- Beloch, K. J. 1893-1904. *Griechische Geschichte*. Strassburg: Trübner.
- Bierling, M. R., ed. 2002. *The Phoenicians in Spain*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns.

- Bikai, P. 1992. Cyprus and Phoenicia: Literary evidence for the Early Iron Age. In *Studies in Honour of Vassos Karageorghis*, ed. G. K. Ioannides, 241-48. Nicosia: Hetaireia Kypraikion Spoudion.
- Blakeway, A. 1935. Prolegomena to the study of Greek commerce with Italy, Sicily and France in the eighth and seventh centuries BC. *Annual of the British School at Athens* 33 : 170-208.
- Boardman, J. 1999.**⁴ *The Greeks Overseas*. London: Thames and Hudson.
- . 2001. Aspects of Colonization. *BASOR* 322 : 33-42.
- . 2005. Al Mina: Notes and queries. *Ancient West and East* 4, no. 2:278-91.
- . 2006. Greeks in the East Mediterranean (South Anatolia, Syria, Egypt). In *Greek Colonisation: An account of Greek colonies and other settlements overseas, volume 1*, ed. G. Tsetschladze, 507-34. Leiden: Brill.
- 2**
- Bondì, S. F. 1995. La société. In *La civilisation phénicienne et punique: Manuel de recherche. Handbuch der orientalistik . Abt. Bd. 20*, ed. V. Krings, 345-53. Leiden: Brill.
- Botto, M. 2005. Per una riconsiderazione della cronologia degli inizi della colonizzazione fenicia nel Mediterraneo centro-occidentale. In *Oriente e Occidente: Metodi e discipline a confronto. Riflessioni sulla cronologia dell'età del ferro in Italia, Atti dell'Incontro di studi, Roma, 30-31 ottobre 2003. Mediterranea*, 1 (2004), ed. G. Bartoloni and F. Delpino, 579-628. Pisa: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali.
- Bouzek, J. 1997. *Greece, Anatolia and Europe: Cultural interrelations during the early Iron Age*. Jonsered, Sweden: Paul Astroms.
- Bunnens, G. 1979. *L'expansion phénicienne en Méditerranée: Essai d'interprétation fondé sur une analyse des traditions littéraires*. Brussels and Rome: Institut historique belge de Rome.
- Bunnens, G. 1983. Considérations géographiques sur la place occupée par la Phénicie dans l'expansion de l'empire Assyrien. *Studia Phoenicia* 2 : 169-193.
- . 1995. Histoire événementielle : Partim Orient. In *La civilisation phénicienne et punique. Manuel de recherche. Handbuch der orientalistik I. Abt. Bd. 20*, ed. V. Krings, 222-36. Leiden: Brill.
- Cohen, A. 1971. Cultural strategies in the organization of trading diasporas. In *The development of indigenous trade and markets in West Africa*, ed. C. Meillassoux, 266-81. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Coldstream, J. N. 1969. The Phoenicians of Ialysos. *BICS* 16 : 1-8.
- . 1998. The first exchanges between Euboeans and Phoenicians: Who took the initiative? In *Mediterranean peoples in transition: In honor of Professor Trude Dothan*, ed. S. Gitin, A. Mazar and E. Stern, 353-60. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.
- . 2000. Exchanges between Phoenicians and Early Greeks. *National Museum News* 11 : 15-32.
- . 2006. Other peoples' pots: Ceramic borrowing between early Greeks and Levantines, in various Mediterranean contexts. In *Across Frontiers: Etruscans, Greeks, Phoenicians and Cypriots. Studies in Honour of David Ridgway and Francesca Romana Serra Ridgway*, ed. E. Herring, I. Lemos, F. Lo Schiavo, L. Vagnetti, R. Whitehouse and J. Wilkins, 49-55. London: Accordia.
- Crielaard, J. P. 1992/93. How the West was won: Euboeans vs. Phoenicians. *Hamburger Beiträge zur Archäologie* 19/20 : 235-60.
- . 1998. Surfing on the Mediterranean web: Cypriot long-distance communications during the eleventh and tenth centuries BC. In *Eastern Mediterranean: Cyprus-Dodecanese-Crete 16th-6th C BC*, ed. V. Karageorghis and N. Stampolidis, 187-204. Athens: University of Crete and A.G. Leventis Foundation.
- . 1999. Production, circulation and consumption of Early Iron Age Greek pottery (eleventh to seventh centuries BC). In *The Complex Past of Pottery*, ed. J. P. Crielaard, V. Stissi and G. J. van Wiggarden, 49-81. Amsterdam: Gieben.

- Culican, W. 1982a. Discussion contribution. In *Phönizier im Westen*, ed. H. G. Niemeyer, 28. Mainz: von Zabern.
- . 1982b. The repertoire of Phoenician pottery. In *Phönizier im Westen*, ed. H. G. Niemeyer, 45-78. Mainz: von Zabern.
- Curtin, P. D. 1984. *Cross-cultural Trade in World History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Descœudres, J.-P., ed. 1990. *Greek Colonists and Native Populations*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Docter, R. F., H. G. Niemeyer, A. J. Nijboer, and J. van der Pilcht. 2005. In *Oriente e Occidente : Metodi e discipline a confronto. Riflessioni sulla cronologia dell'età del ferro in Italia*, ed. G. Bartoloni and F. Delpino, 557-77. Pisa: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali.
- Dominguez, A. J. 1989. *La colonización griega en Sicilia: Griegos, indígenas y púnicos en la Sicilia arcaica; intracción y aculturación*. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports.
- Donner, H. 1982. The interdependence of internal affairs and foreign policy during the David-Solomonic period with special regard to the Phoenician coast. In *Studies in the Period of David and Solomon*, ed. T. Ishida, 205-14. Tokyo: Yamakawa-Shuppansha.
- Fletcher, R. 2004. Sidonians, Tyrians and Greeks in the Mediterranean: The evidence from Egyptianising scarabs. *Ancient West and East* 3, no. 1: 51-77.
- Frankenstein, S. 1979. The Phoenicians in the Far West: A function of Neo-Assyrian imperialism. In *Power and Propaganda: A symposium on ancient empires*, ed. M. T. Larsen, 263-94. Copenhagen: Akademisk Forlag.
- Gosden, C. 2004. *Archaeology and Colonialism*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gras, M., P. Rouillard and X. Teixidor. 1989. *L'Univers phénicien*. Paris: Arthaud.
- Gubel, E. 1994. Phoenician foundations in archaeological perspective. In *Nuove fondazioni nel Vicino Oriente Antico: Realtà e ideologia, Atti del colloquio 4-6 Dicembre 1991, Pisa*, ed. S. Mazzoni, 341-55. Pisa.
- . 2006. Notes of the Phoenician component of the orientaling horizon. In *Debating Orientalization: Multidisciplinary approaches to change in the ancient Mediterranean*, ed. C. Riva and N. C. Vella, 85-93. London: Equinox.
- Hales, S. and T. Hodos, eds. 2008. *Local and global identities: Rethinking identity and material culture in the ancient world*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hansen, M. H. 2006. *Emporion: A study of the use and meaning of the term in the Archaic and Classical periods*. In *Greek colonisation: An account of Greek colonies and other settlements overseas, volume 1*, ed. G. R. Tsatsikis, 1-39. Leiden: Brill.
- Hansen, M. H. and T. H. Nielsen, eds. 2004. *An inventory of archaic and classical poleis: An investigation conducted by the Copenhagen Polis Centre for the Danish National Research Foundation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harris, E. M. and L. Rubenstein. 2004. Introduction. In *The law and the courts in ancient Greece*, ed. E. M. Harris and L. Rubenstein, 1-18. London: Duckworth.
- Harris, E. M. and L. Rubenstein, eds. 2004. *The law and the courts in Ancient Greece*. London: Duckworth.
- Hind, J. 1995/96. Traders and ports-of-trade (*emporoi* and *emporía*) in the Black Sea in antiquity. *Il Mar Nero* 2 : 113-26.
- . 1997. Colonies and ports-of-trade on the northern shores of the Black Sea: Borystyhenes, Kremnoi and "other Pontic *emporía*" in Herodotus. In *Yet More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, ed. T. H. Nielsen, 107-16. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Hodos, T. 2006. *Local responses to colonization in the Iron Age Mediterranean*. London: Routledge.
- . 2008. Local and global perspectives in the study of social and cultural identity. In *Local and global identities: Rethinking identity and material culture in the ancient world*, ed. S. Hales and T. Hodos, **PAGES**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Press.
- Krings, V., ed. 1995. *La civilisation phénicienne et punique. Manuel de recherche. Handbuch der orientalistik I. Abt. Bd. 20*. Leiden: Brill.
- Lancel, S. 1995. *Carthage: A history*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lemos, I. 2003. Craftsmen, traders and some wives in Early Iron Age Greece. In *Ploes: Sea routes: Interconnections in the Mediterranean, 16th-6th c. BC: Proceedings of the international symposium held at Rethymnon, Crete, September 29th-October 2nd, 2002*, ed. N. C. Stampolidis and V. Karageorghis, 187-93. Athens: University of Crete and the A. G. Leventis Foundation.
- Lipinski, E. 2004. *Itineraria Phoenicia*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Lomas, K., ed. 2004. *Greek identity in the western Mediterranean: Papers in honour of Brian Shefton*. Leiden: Brill.
- Luke, J. 2003. *Ports of trade, Al Mina and geometric Greek pottery in the Levant*. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Malkin, I. 1994. Inside and outside: Colonization and the formation of the mother city. In *Apoikia: I piu antichi insediamenti greci in Occidente*, ed. B. D'Agostino and D. Ridgway, 1-9. Naples: Annali di archeologica e storia antica.
- Malkin, I. 1997. Categories of early Greek colonization: The case of the Dorian Aegean. In *Il dinamismo della colonizzazione greca*, ed. C. Antonetti, 25-38. Naples: Loffredo.
- Markoe, G. E. 1996. The emergence of orientalizing in Greek art: Some observations on the interchange between Greeks and Phoenicians in the eighth and seventh centuries BC. *BASOR* 301 : 47-67.
- . 2000. *Phoenicians*. London: British Museum Press.
- Moorey, R. 1991. *A century of biblical archaeology*. Cambridge: Lutterworth Press.
- Morris, I. 1991. The early polis as city and state. In *City and Country in the Ancient World*, ed. J. Rich and A. Wallace-Hadrill, 25-57. London: Routledge.
- Morris, S. 1992. *Daedalos and the origins of Greek art*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Moscatti, S. 1966. *The World of the Phoenicians*. London: Cardinal.
- . 1993. Nuovi studi sull'identità fenicia. In *Accademia nazionale dei Lincei, memorie della classe delle scienze morali serie 9.4*: 3-89.
- Muhly, J. D. 1985. Phoenicia and the Phoenicians. *Biblical archaeology today: Proceedings of the International Congress on Biblical Archaeology, Jerusalem, April 1984*, 177-91. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society; Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities in cooperation with the American Schools of Oriental Research.
- Negbi, O. 1992. Early Phoenician presence in the Mediterranean islands: A reappraisal. *AJA* 96 : 599-615.
- Niemeyer, H. G. 1990. The Phoenicians in the Mediterranean: A non-Greek model for expansion and settlement in antiquity. In *Greek Colonists and Native Populations*, ed. J. P. Descoeudres, 469-89. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 1993. Trade before the flag? On the principles of Phoenician expansion in the Mediterranean. In *Biblical Archaeology Today 1990*, ed. A. Biran and J. Aviram, 335-44. Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society.
- . 1995. Expansion et colonisation. In *La civilisation phénicienne et punique. Manuel de recherche. Handbuch der Orientalistik I. Abt. Bd. 20V*, ed. Krings, V., 247-67. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2002. The Early Phoenician city-states on the Mediterranean: Archaeological elements for their description. In *A comparative study of thirty city-state cultures*, ed. M. H. Hansen, 89-115. Copenhagen: Diet Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab.
- . 2003. On Phoenician art and its role in trans-Mediterranean interconnections ca. 1100-600 BC. In *Ploes: Sea routes: Interconnections in the Mediterranean, 16th-6th c. BC: Proceedings of the international symposium held at Rethymnon, Crete*,

- September 29th-October 2nd, 2002, ed. N. C. Stampolidis and V. Karageorghis, 201-07. Athens: University of Crete and the A. G. Leventis Foundation.
- _____. 2004. The Phoenicians and the birth of a multinational Mediterranean society. In *Commerce and monetary systems in the ancient world: Means of transmission and cultural interaction: Proceedings of the fifth annual symposium of the Assyrian and Babylonian Intellectual Heritage Project, held in Innsbruck, Austria, October 3rd - 8th 2002*, ed. R. Rollinger and C. Ulf, 245-56. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- _____. 2006. The Phoenicians in the Mediterranean: Between expansion and colonisation: A non-Greek model of overseas settlement and presence. In *Greek Colonisation: An account of Greek colonies and other settlements overseas. Volume 1*, ed. G. Tsatskheladze, 143-168. Leiden: Brill.
- Nijboer, A. J. 2005. La cronologia assoluta dell'età del Ferro nel Mediterraneo, dibattito sui metodi e sui risultati. In *Oriente e occidente: Metodi e discipline a confronto. Riflessioni sulla cronologia dell'età del ferro in Italia, atti dell'incontro di studi, Roma, 30-31 ottobre 2003. Mediterranea, 1 (2004)*, ed. G. Bartoloni and F. Delpino, 527-56. Pisa: Istituti Editoriali e Poligrafici Internazionali.
- _____. 2006a. An interpretation of the radiocarbon determinations of the oldest indigenous-Phoenician stratum thus far, excavated at Huelva, Tartessos (south-west Spain). *BABesch* 81 : 31-6.
- _____. 2006b. The Iron Age in the Mediterranean: A chronological mess or 'Trade before the flag,' Part II. *Ancient West and East* 4, no. 2: 255-77.
- Oded, B. 1974. The Phoenician cities and the Assyrian empire in the time of Tiglath-pileser III. *Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins* 90 : 38-49.
- Osborne, R. 1998. Early Greek colonization? The nature of Greek settlement in the west. In *Archaic Greece: New approaches and new evidence*, ed. N. Fisher and H. van Wees, 251-69. London: Duckworth.
- Owen, S. 2005. Analogy, archaeology and Archaic Greek colonization. In *Ancient colonizations: Analogy, similarity and difference*, ed. H. Hurst and S. Owen, 5-22. London: Duckworth.
- Papadopoulos, J. K. 1997. Phantom Euboians. *Journal of Mediterranean Archaeology* 10 : 191-206.
- _____. 1998. From Macedonia to Sardinia: Problems of Iron Age Aegean chronology, and assumptions of Greek maritime primacy. In *Sardinia and Aegean chronology: Towards a resolution of relative and absolute dating in the Mediterranean*, ed. M. S. Balmouth and R. H. Tykot, 363-9. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Pastor Borgoñon, H. 1988-90. Die phönizier: Eine begriffsgeschichtliche untersuchung. *Hamburger Beiträge zur Archäologie* 15/17 : 37-142.
- Raaflaub, K. A. 2004. Archaic Greek aristocrats as carriers of cultural interaction. In *Commerce and monetary systems in the ancient world: Means of transmission and cultural interaction: Proceedings of the fifth annual symposium of the Assyrian and Babylonian Intellectual Heritage Project, held in Innsbruck, Austria, October 3rd - 8th 2002*, ed. R. Rollinger and C. Ulf, 197-217. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Ridgway, D. 2004. Euboians and others along the Tyrrhenian seaboard. In *Greek Identity in the Western Mediterranean*, ed. K. Lomas, 15-33. Leiden: Brill.
- Röllig, W. 1982. Die phönizier des mutterlandes zur zeit der kolonisierung. In *Die phönizier im westen*, ed. Niemeyer, 15-28.
- Sagona, C. 2004. The Phoenicians in Spain from a central Mediterranean perspective: A review essay. *ANES* 41 : 240-266.
- Sherratt, S. 2003. Visible writing: Questions of script and identity in early Iron Age Greece and Cyprus. *OJA* 22, no. 3: 225-42.
- Sommer, M. 2004. Die peripherie als zentrum: Die phöniker und der interkontinentale fernhandel im weltssystem der eisenzeit. In *Commerce and monetary systems in the ancient world: Means of transmission and cultural interaction: Proceedings of the fifth annual symposium of the Assyrian and Babylonian Intellectual Heritage Project, held in*

- Innsbruck, Austria, October 3rd - 8th 2002, ed. R. Rollinger and C. Ulf, 233-44. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- _____. 2005. *Die phönizier. Handelsherren zwischen orient und okzident*. Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag.
- Stamplidīs, N. C. 2003. On the Phoenician presence in the Aegean. In *Ploes: Sea routes: Interconnections in the Mediterranean, 16th-6th c. BC: Proceedings of the international symposium held at Rethymnon, Crete, September 29th-October 2nd, 2002*, ed. N. C. Stamplidīs and V. Karageorghis, 217-30. Athens: University of Crete and the A. G. Leventis Foundation.
- Stein, G. 2002. Colonies without colonialism: A trade diaspora model of fourth millennium BC Mesopotamian enclaves in Anatolia. In *The Archaeology of Colonialism*, ed. C. L. Lyons and J. K. Papadopoulos, 27-64. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute.
- Trigger, B. 1989. *A history of archaeological thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tsetskhladze, G. R., ed. 1999. *Ancient Greeks West and East*. Leiden: Brill.
- Tsetskhladze, G. R., ed. 2006a. *Greek colonisation: An account of Greek colonies and other settlements overseas, volume 1*. Leiden: Brill.
- Tsetskhladze, G. R. 2006b. Revisiting ancient Greek colonisation. In *Greek Colonisation: An account of Greek colonies and other settlements overseas, volume 1*, ed. G. R. Tsetskhladze, xxiii-lxxxiii. Leiden: Brill.
- Tsetskhladze, G. R. and F. De Angelis, eds. 1994. *The archaeology of Greek colonisation*. Oxford: Oxford University Committee for Archaeology.
- Turfa, J. 2001. Review of G. E. Markoe. *The Phoenicians*. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2001.05.09.
- van Dommelen, P. 2000. Ambiguous matters: colonialism and local identities in Punic Sardinia. In C. Lyons and J. Papadopoulos, eds. *The Archaeology of Colonialism* (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute) 121-147.
- _____. 2005. Colonial interactions and hybrid practices. In *The archaeology of colonial encounters*, ed. G. J. Stein, 109-41. Santa Fe: School of American Research Press.
- Vella, N. 1996. Elusive Phoenicians. *Antiquity* 70 : 245-50.
- Wilson, J. P. 1997. The nature of Greek overseas settlements in the Archaic period: *Emporion* or *apoikia*. In *The development of the polis in Archaic Greece*, ed. L. G. Mitchell and P. J. Rhodes, 199-207. New York: Routledge.
- Winter, I. J. 1995. Homer's Phoenicians: History, ethnography, or literary trope? [A perspective on early Orientalism]. In *The Ages of Homer: A tribute to Emily Townsend Vermeule*, ed. J. B. Carter and S. P. Morris, 247-71. Austin: University of Texas Press.

